APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,052	06/29/2005	Markus Baumeister	US030019US	6083

24737   7590   09/07/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
NISSAN, BARAK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/541,052	BAUMEISTER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barak Nissan	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *6/29/2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/29/2005*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Application No. 10541052, filed 6/29/2005,

claims 1-35 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: The terms first-level, second-level, and third-level, graph

mapper qualitative rating are not explained in the specification as being understood.

3.   The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a
utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should
include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in
upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the
section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR
       DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A
       COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
       (1) Field of the Invention.
       (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37
       CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(I) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The specification should be broken down into sections. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims **5, 6, 14-16, 20-22, 24,** and **26-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For example in claim 14, it appears that the subject matter that is claims "qualitative rating" provided in this invention fails to point out what is determined by quality. Qualitative is related to quality that is defined as an essential and distinguishing attribute of something. Therefore, "qualitative rating" is indefinite and unclear to one ordinary skilled in the art.

6.   Claims **31-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For example in claim 31, it appears that the subject matter that is claims "composite qualitative rating" provided in this invention is not properly defined.

Therefore, the claimed invention is inoperative and lacks enablement. The phrase will

just be interpreted as rating the quality by the combination of multiple sources.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8.   Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Laksono (US 7099951).

9.   Regarding claim 1, Laksono teaches an apparatus (i.e. multimedia system, Fig.

2, Fig. 5) for selecting an application to deliver content in a networked consumer

environment (home, col 2, line 46) based on multiple factors (e.g. availability Fig. 63,

steps 1458-1462), comprising:

a means (client module, col 9, lines 56-63) for receiving an initial content

(service, col 22, lines 58-60) selection; (e.g. audio playback, col 9, lines 58-63)

a means (network interface controller, col 52, lines 64-66) for i) accessing

(access the requested type, col 23, lines 6-10) a list of registered applications (email

application or web browser application, Fig. 13) for delivering content (service, col 22

lines 43-50, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11) in the consumer environment (the

applications provided within the multimedia server such as email application or web

browser application are delivered within a home network or any type of consumer

environment, Fig. 13, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11) and ii) accessing

information identifying (multimedia server, Fig. 6) one or more types of content

(television, dvd player, etc, Fig.1, col 22 lines 43-50) supported by each registered

application (email application or web browser application, Fig. 13) in the list of

registered applications; (col 22, lines 9-25, video graphics processing applications [col

22, lines 26-33], Fig. 59, steps 1362-1364)

a means for (204 processing module at multimedia server (42), col 14, lines 45-

59) i) determining (multimedia server, col 19, lines 49-59) if any registered applications

(email application or web browser application, Fig. 13, col 22 line 51-col 23 line 10) in

the list of registered applications support any content types (e.g. dvd audio playback,

Fig. 4, service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11) associated

with the selected content (multimedia services, abstract), and ii) identifying (multimedia

server, Fig. 6) each registered application (i.e. email application or video processing

application, Fig. 13) in the list of registered applications that supports any of the content

types (service, col 22, lines 58-60, Fig. 4) associated with the selected content as a

compatible application. (col 22 line 42- col 24, line 5, (e.g. video graphics processing

application, col 22, lines 26-33))

10.   Regarding claim 2, Laksono teaches the apparatus (i.e. multimedia system, Fig.

2, Fig. 5) as set forth according to claim 1, as described above, the determining

((multimedia server, col 19, lines 49-59), Fig. 65) and identifying means further

including: (multimedia server, col 43, lines 15-17)

a means for identifying (i.e. multimedia server, col 9, lines 66-67) zero or more

equivalent content references (audio data from the audio sources, col 9, line 67)

associated with the initial content selection ((service, col 22, lines 58-60) , e.g. audio

playback, col 9, line 67), the combination of the initial content selection (col 22 lines 43-

50) and the equivalent content references forming a list (single transmission, col 9, lines

56-67, col 10, lines 1-3) of selected content. (audio sources such as radio player, and

dvd player for audio data, col 9, lines 56-67, col 10, lines 1-3).

11.   Regarding claim 3, Laksono teaches the apparatus (i.e. multimedia system, Fig.

2, Fig. 5) as set forth in claim 1, as described above, further including:

a means for receiving (client module, col 9, lines 56-63) an initial location

selection (col 10, lines 52-65) within the consumer environment (home, col 2, lines 33-

46) to which the content is to be delivered (multimedia sources, col 10, lines 52-65);

a means for accessing (col 23, lines 6-10) information identifying (network

interface controller, col 13, lines 15-18) the user interface (i.e. client interface within the

client module receives a request to identify the client's desire to connect to some

network source, col 13, lines 7-18) requirements associated with each compatible

application (client to client communication, col 13, line 12 or Fig. 13 [within multimedia

server]);

a means (network interface controller, col 52, lines 64-66) for i) accessing (col

23, lines 6-10) a list of sink resources (monitor, television set, col 55, lines 51-54) for

delivering content (service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11),

in the consumer environment (in-home, col 1, line 7) and ii) accessing one or more

graphs (channel select, volume control, picture quality, col 6, line 46) for each

compatible application (video graphics processing application, col 22, lines 26-33) each

graph identifying sink resource (monitor, speakers, col 55, lines 51-54) requirements

associated with the corresponding compatible application (e.g., web browser

applications, email applications, etc., col 8, lines 27-28); and

a means (204 processing module at multimedia server (42), col 14, lines 45-59)

for i) determining (col 5, lines 62) if any sink resource (monitor, speakers, col 55, lines

51-54) in the initially selected (col 10, lines 52-65) location supports the user interface

requirements (i.e. client interface within the client module receives a request to identify

the client's desire to connect to some network source, col 13, lines 7-18) and the sink

resource requirements of any of the compatible applications and ii) identifying (i.e.

multimedia server, col 9, lines 66-67) each compatible application having sink resource

requirements that are satisfied by one or more sink resources in the initially selected

location as a selected application. (determining multimedia system having excess

available resources for the applications requested by the client, Fig. 63, (col 22 line 42-

col 24, line 5))

12.   Regarding claim 4, Laksono teaches the apparatus (i.e. multimedia system, Fig.

2, Fig. 5) as set forth according to claim 1, as described above, further including:

a means (network interface controller, col 13, lines 15-18) for i) accessing a list of

sources of content ((service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11)

,client module accessing the channel selection (sources), col 12, lines 1-6) associated

with the consumer environment (in-home, col 1, line 7) and ii) accessing one or more

graphs (channel select, volume control, picture quality, col 6, line 46) for each

compatible application, each graph identifying source resource (e.g. dvd playback, col

12, line 6) requirements associated with the corresponding compatible application; and

a means (204 processing module at multimedia server (42), col 14, lines 45-59)

for i) identifying (i.e. client module, col 10, line 17) each source that provides any of the

selected content (e.g. dvd playback, col 12, line 6), ii) determining if any source

associated with any of the selected content supports the source resource requirements

of any of the compatible applications (Fig. 65), and iii) identifying (i.e. client module, col

10, lines 17-22) each compatible application having source resource requirements that

are satisfied by any source associated with the selected content as a selected

application. (col 22 line 42- col 24, line 5, e.g. audio playback, col 10, lines 17-22).

13.   Regarding claim 5, Laksono teaches the apparatus apparatus (i.e. multimedia

system, Fig. 2, Fig. 5) as set forth in claim 1, as described above, further including:

a means (network interface controller, col 13, lines 15-18) for i) accessing

information (channel selection, col 7, line 49) associated with user preferences (col 7,

lines 42-51) for each compatible application, ii) accessing information associated with

previous executions of each compatible application (execution on channel selections,

Fig. 33), and iii) accessing one or more graphs (channel select, volume control, picture

quality, col 6, line 46) for each compatible application, each graph (channel selection,

col 5, lines 63-67) identifying (client, col 5, line 61) resource requirements associated

with the corresponding compatible application; (col 5, lines, 59-67) and

a means (204 processing module at multimedia server (42), col 14, lines 45-59,

col 61, line 33) for determining a qualitative rating (e.g. video program, col 61, lines 36-

42) for each graph based on at least one of the user preference information (i.e.

resolution, col 61, line 37), the previous executions information (video program, Fig. 64),

and information associated with a graph preference by the corresponding compatible

application. (Fig. 64)

14.   Regarding claim 6, Laksono teaches the apparatus as set forth in claim 4, as

described above, further including:

a means for selecting (204 processing module at multimedia server (42), col 14,

lines 45-59 the compatible application with the highest qualitative rating (e.g. video

program, col 61, lines 36-42) to deliver the content. ("allocate best match resources to

fulfill the clients request", Fig. 65)

15.   Regarding claim 7, Laksono teaches the apparatus as set forth according to

claim 1, as described above, wherein the accessing means is a network (network

interface controller, col 52, lines 64-66) interconnecting a plurality of electronic devices.

(Fig. 5)

16.   Regarding claim 8, Laksono teaches the apparatus as set forth in claim 1, as

described above, wherein the receiving means is a user interface (client, abstract)

associated with a sink resource (abstract, e.g. speaker, Fig. 51).

17.   Regarding claim 9, Laksono teaches the apparatus as set forth in claim 1, as

described above, wherein the receiving means is a user interface (client, abstract)

associated with a source resource. (abstract, e.g. video camera, Fig.51)

18.   Regarding claim 10, Laksono teaches the apparatus as set forth in claim 1, as

described above, wherein the identifying and determining means is centralized

processing resource. (multimedia server, Fig. 4, Fig. 5, processing module, Fig. 7)

19.   Regarding claim 11, Laksono teaches the apparatus as set forth in claim 1, as

described above, wherein the identifying and determining (col 6, lines 1-12) means is a

de-centralized (client module, resources, Fig. 5, Fig. 65) processing resource

associated with a cluster (resources such as dvd player, cd player, etc, Fig. 4, home

environment (col 2, lines 33-46).

20.   Regarding claim 12, Laksono teaches a method for selecting an application to

deliver content (col 22 line 43- col 23 line 10, col 23 line 60- col 24 line 11) in a

        networked consumer environment (home, col 2, line 46) based on

multiple factors (e.g. availability Fig. 63, steps 1458-1462), as described according to

claim 1 the method comprising:

        a) receiving an initial content selection (service, col 22, lines 58-60); (e.g. audio

playback, col 9, lines 58-63)

        b) accessing (network interface controller, col 52, lines 64-66) a list of registered

applications (email application or web browser application, Fig. 13) for delivering

content (service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11) in the

consumer environment;

        c) accessing (col 23, lines 6-10) information identifying (multimedia server, Fig.

6) one or more types of content (col 22 lines 43-50, Fig. 4, Fig. 1) supported

by each registered application (email application or web browser application, Fig. 13) in

the list of registered applications; (col 22 line 42- col 24, line 5, col 22, lines 9-25, video

graphics processing applications [col 22, lines 26-33])

d) determining (204 processing module at multimedia server (42), col 14, lines

45-59, col 61, line 33) if any registered applications (email application or web browser

application, Fig. 13) in the list of registered applications support any content types (dvd

audio playback, and cd player, Fig. 4) associated with the selected content (multimedia

services, col 19, lines 49-67); and

e) identifying (multimedia server, Fig. 6) each registered application (email

application or web browser application, Fig. 13, service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines

10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11) in the list of registered applications that supports any of

the content types associated with the selected content as a compatible application.

(col 22, line 42- col 24, line 5, video graphics processing application, col 22, lines 26-

33)

21.   Regarding claim 13, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as

described in claim 2, further including before step b):

identifying zero or more equivalent content references associated with the initial

content selection, the combination of the initial content selection and the equivalent

content references forming a list of selected content. (Same limitations according to

claim 2, rationale of rejection is applicable.)

22.   Regarding claim 14, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 13, as

described above, wherein a qualitative rating between 0 and 100 percent (interpreted to

be poor quality to best quality) is associated with the initial content selection (e.g. video

program, col 61, line 36) and each equivalent content reference (the alternative

multimedia service, Fig. 64)) based on an individual comparison of each of the initial

content selection (e.g. video program, col 61, line 36) and equivalent content references

to one of the initial content selection (sufficient resources, Fig. 64) and equivalent

content references having the highest quality. (when the use of at least some of the

resources is not optimal, adjust the allocation of the resources, Fig. 64)

23.   Regarding claim 15, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 14, as

described above, wherein the list of selected content (alternative multimedia service is

available, Fig. 64) is limited to the initially selected content (e.g. for a video program,

adjust resolution to a default resolution, Fig. 64) and equivalent content references with

qualitative ratings above a predetermined value. (resources is not optimal, adjust the

allocation of the resources, Fig. 64)

24.   Regarding claim 16, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 14, as

described above, wherein the list of selected content service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23

lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11 including the qualitative ratings is provided to a user

for reduction one or more items for further application selection processing. (e.g. video

program, adjusting video quality to default video quality, Fig. 64)

25.   Regarding claim 17, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as

described above, further including:

        receiving (client module, col 9, lines 56-62) an initial location selection (e.g.

audio playback, col 9, lines 58-63) within the consumer environment (home, col 2, line

46) to which the content is to be delivered;

accessing information identifying (Fig. 34) the user interface requirements

associated with each compatible application (Fig. 34, steps 900-908);

accessing (col 6, lines 1-12) a list of sink resources (monitor, television

set, col 55, lines 51-54) for delivering content in the consumer environment (in-home,

col 1, line 7);

accessing one or more graphs (channel select, volume control, picture

quality, col 6, line 46) for each compatible application (col 22, line 42- col 24, line 5,

video graphics processing application, col 22, lines 26-33), each graph identifying (client

module, col 55, lines 44-58) sink resource (monitor, speakers, col 55, lines 51-54)

requirements associated with the corresponding compatible application (e.g., web

browser applications, email applications, etc., col 8, lines 27-28);

determining (i.e. multimedia services, col 5, lines 45-67) if any sink resource

(monitor, speakers, col 55, lines 51-54) in the initially selected location supports the

user interface requirements (i.e. client interface within the client module receives a

request to identify the client's desire to connect to some network source, col 13, lines 7-

18) and the sink resource requirements of any of the compatible applications; and

identifying (i.e. multimedia server, col 9, lines 5-31, line 20) each compatible

application having sink resource requirements that are satisfied by one or more sink

resources in the initially selected location as a selected application. (determining

multimedia system having excess available resources for the applications requested by

the client, Fig. 63)

26.   Regarding claim 18, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as
described above, further including:

accessing a list of sources of content associated with the consumer environment;

identifying each source that provides any of the selected content; accessing one
or more graphs for each compatible application, each graph identifying source resource
requirements associated with the corresponding compatible application;

determining if any source associated with any of the selected content supports
the source resource requirements of any of the compatible applications; and

identifying each compatible application having source resource requirements that
are satisfied by any source associated with the selected content as a selected
application. (Same limitations according to claim 4, rationale of rejection is applicable.)

27.   Regarding claim 19, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as
described above, further including:

accessing information associated with user preferences (multimedia server,
settings, col 60, lines 41-49) for each compatible application;

accessing information associated with previous executions of each compatible
application;

accessing one or more graphs for each compatible application, each graph
identifying resource requirements associated with the corresponding compatible
application; and

determining a qualitative rating for each graph based on at least one of the user
preference information, the previous executions information, and information associated

with a graph preference by the corresponding compatible application. (Same limitations according to claim 5, rationale of rejection is applicable.)

28.   Regarding claim 20, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 19, as described above further including:

selecting the compatible application with the highest qualitative rating to deliver the content. (Same limitations according to claim 6, rationale of rejection is applicable.)

29.   Regarding claim 21, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 19, as described above, further including:

providing (multimedia server, Fig. 13, e.g. dvd playback, col 9, lines 5-31) a list of the compatible applications (applications within the multimedia server Fig. 13) including the qualitative ratings to a user (client module, col 9, lines 56-63) for selection of the application to deliver the content. (e.g. video program, adjusting video quality to default video quality, Fig. 64, abstract)

30.   Regarding claim 22, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 21 the list of the compatible applications (applications within the multimedia server Fig. 13) provided to the user is limited to applications with qualitative ratings above a predetermined value. (resources is not optimal, adjust the allocation of the resources, Fig. 64)

31.   Regarding claim 23, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as described above, further including:

accessing information associated with the allocated state of resources within the consumer environment; (allocate at least some of the resources to fulfill the client

request based on a multimedia system resource allocation procedure, Fig. 63)

accessing one or more graphs (channel select, volume control, picture quality,

col 6, line 46) for each compatible application (video graphics processing application,

col 22, lines 26-33), each graph identifying resource requirements (allocate further

resources to support enhanced features, Fig. 63) associated with the corresponding

compatible application;

determining if any available resource supports any of the resource requirements

of any of the compatible applications; (determine whether the multimedia system has

sufficient resources to fulfill the client request, Fig. 63) and

identifying each compatible application (email application or web browser

application, Fig. 13) having resource requirements that are satisfied by one or more

resources within the consumer environment as a selected application. (determining

multimedia system having excess available resources for the applications requested by

the client, Fig. 63)

32.   Regarding claim 24, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 22, as

described above, wherein a qualitative rating between 0 and 100 percent (interpreted to

be poor quality to best quality) is associated with each selected application (email

application or web browser application, Fig. 13), the qualitative rating being related to

the effect on the consumer environment of selecting that particular application to deliver

the content. (perform a best match analysis to identify the best match resource, Fig. 65,

in-home environment, col 1, line 7)

33.   Regarding claim 25, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 24

wherein the effect on the consumer environment (in-home environment, col 1, line 7) is at least associated with the use of scarce resources. (bandwidth, col 14, lines 53-55)

34.   Regarding claim 26, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 24, further including:

selecting the selected application with the highest qualitative rating to deliver the content. (quality of video resolution, col 61, lines 36-52)

35.   Regarding claim 27, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 24, as described above, further including:

providing a list of the selected applications including the qualitative ratings to a user for selection of the application to deliver the content. (Same limitations according to claim 21, rationale of rejection is applicable.)

36.   Regarding claim 28, Laksono teaches the method as set forth according to claim 27, as described above, wherein the list of the selected applications (e.g. video graphics processing application, col 22, lines 26-33) provided to the user is limited to applications with qualitative ratings above a predetermined value. (resources is not optimal, adjust the allocation of the resources, Fig. 64)

37.   Regarding claim 29, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as described above, further including:

f) receiving an initial location selection within the consumer environment to which the content is to be delivered;

g) accessing information identifying the user interface requirements associated with each first-level (interpreted as first application begin processed) compatible

application;

h) accessing a list of sink resources for delivering content in the consumer environment;

i) accessing one or more graphs for each first-level compatible application, each graph identifying sink resource requirements associated with the corresponding first-level (interpreted as first application begin processed) compatible application;

j) determining if any sink resource in the initially selected location supports the user interface requirements and the sink resource requirements of any of the first-level (interpreted as first application begin processed) compatible applications;

k) identifying each first-level (interpreted as first application begin processed) compatible application having sink resource requirements that are satisfied by one or more sink resources in the initially selected location as a second-level (interpreted as second application begin processed) compatible application;

l) accessing a list of sources of content associated with the consumer environment;

m) identifying each source that provides any of the selected content;

n) accessing one or more graphs for each second-level (interpreted as second application begin processed) compatible application, each graph identifying source resource requirements associated with the corresponding second- level (interpreted as second application begin processed) compatible application;

o) determining if any source associated with any of the selected content supports the source resource requirements of any of the second-level (interpreted as second

application begin processed) compatible applications;

p) identifying each second-level (interpreted as second application begin

processed) compatible application having source resource requirements that are

satisfied by any source associated with the selected content as a third- level (interpreted

as third application begin processed) compatible application;

q) accessing information associated with user preferences for each third-level

(interpreted as third application begin processed) compatible application;

r) accessing information associated with previous executions of each third-level

(interpreted as third application begin processed) compatible application;

s) accessing one or more graphs for each third-level (interpreted as third

application begin processed) compatible application, each graph identifying resource

requirements associated with the corresponding third-level compatible application;

t) determining (client, Fig. 63) a first qualitative rating for each third level

(interpreted as third application begin processed) compatible application based on at

least one of a content qualitative rating (e.g. video quality, Fig. 64), a user interface

qualitative rating (determine whether allocation of the resources can be reallocated to

fulfill the client request, Fig. 64), an application qualitative rating (e.g. video program,

Fig. 64), a user (client, Fig. 64) qualitative rating, a graph qualitative rating (default video

picture quality, Fig. 64) and a graph mapper (sufficient resources requested by client,

Fig. 64) qualitative rating;

u) accessing information associated with the allocated state of resources within

the consumer environment;

v) determining if any' available resource supports any of the resource

requirements of any of the third-level (interpreted as third application begin processed)

compatible applications; and

w) identifying each third-level (interpreted as third application begin processed)

compatible application having resource requirements that are satisfied by one or more

resources within the consumer environment as a selected application.

*All the limitations provided were very similar to the claim limitations mentioned

Above of all the other claims, rationale of rejection is applicable.*

38.   Regarding claim 30, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 29, as

described above, further including:

determining (client, Fig 63) a second qualitative rating for each third level

(interpreted as third application begin processed) compatible application different from

the first qualitative rating and based on at least one of a content qualitative rating a user

interface qualitative rating, an application qualitative rating, a user qualitative rating, a

graph qualitative rating, and a graph mapper qualitative rating. The limitations provided

were very similar to claim 29 limitations mentioned above, rationale of rejection is

applicable

39.   Regarding claim 31, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 30, as

described above, further including:

multiplying (interpreted as putting together) the first qualitative rating by the

second qualitative rating to identify a composite qualitative rating for each selected

application. (determining if resources is valid for the client request, Fig. 63, col 60, lines

41-53)

40.   Regarding claim 32, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 31, as

described above, further including:

selecting the selected application with the highest composite qualitative (optimal,

Fig. 65) rating to deliver (client request to receive resource, Fig. 65) the content.

41.   Regarding claim 33, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 31, as

described above, further including:

providing a list of the selected applications (selected resources, Fig. 65) including

the composite qualitative ratings to a user for selection of the application to deliver the

content. The limitations provided were very similar to claim 31 limitations mentioned

above, rationale of rejection is applicable.

42.   Regarding claim 34, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 32, as

described above, wherein the list of the selected applications provided to the user is

limited to applications with composite qualitative ratings above a predetermined value.

The limitations provided were very similar to claim 28 limitations mentioned above,

rationale of rejection is applicable.

43.   Regarding claim 35, Laksono teaches the method as set forth in claim 12, as

described above, further including:

f) selecting a content source (e.g. audio playback, col 9, line 67) and at least one

sink resource for delivering (client interface, e.g. speaker, Fig. 51) the selected content

using at least two of: (service, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-

11)

an initial location selection within the consumer environment (in-home col 1, line

7) to which the content is to be delivered (e.g. audio playback, col 9, line 67);

user interface requirements associated with each compatible application (i.e.

client interface within the client module receives a request to identify the client's desire

to connect to some network source, col 13, lines 7-18, col 22 line 51 –col 23 line 10);

sink resources (e.g. speaker, Fig. 51) available for delivering content in the

consumer environment (in-home col 1, line 7);

sink resource requirements associated with the corresponding compatible

application; (Fig. 4)

sink resources in the initially selected location;

sources of content (col 10 lines 52-67, col 11 lines 1-11) associated with the

consumer environment; (homes, col 2 line 46)

sources that provide at least part of the selected content; (e.g. speaker, audio

processor, Fig. 51)

source resource requirements associated with the corresponding compatible

application; (email application or web browser application, Fig. 13, col 22 lines 43-50,

col 23 lines 10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11)

sources (speaker, Fig. 51) associated with any part of the selected content

(audio playback, col 9, line 67) that supports the source resource requirements of any

oft he compatible applications;

preferences (settings, col 60, lines 41-49) for each compatible application;

previous executions (execution on channel selections, Fig. 33) of each

compatible application; and

resource requirements associated with corresponding compatible applications;

(email application or web browser application, Fig. 13, col 22 lines 43-50, col 23 lines

10, 60-67, col 24 lines 1-11)

g) identifying an optimized allocation of source, application, and sink resources

for the users; (optimal, Fig. 64) and

h) delivering the selected content (receiving selection, abstract) to a sink

resource in the selected location. (e.g. client module to dvd audio playback, Fig. 4)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Barak Nissan whose telephone number is (571)-270-

3632. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thrus 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Beatriz Prieto can be reached on (571)-272-3902. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Barak Nissan

B.N.

BEATRIZ PRIETO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER